

## REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the non-final Office Action mailed on November 14, 2005. Claims 20, 22 to 28, and 32 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 2, 3, 9, 12, and 13 have been amended. No new matter is added by these amendments.

The Office Action rejected Claims 2 to 4, 9, 12 to 14, and 23 to 25 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants have amended Claims 2, 3, 12, and 13 to replace the phrase "wire-like" with "wire", as suggested by the Office Action. Applicants have also clarified Claim 9 by changing the phrase "collected second" to "said collector." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections have been overcome.

The Office Action rejected Claims 1 to 39 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 to 11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,350,417. The Office Action indicated that, upon filing of a proper terminal disclaimer, Claims 1, 5 to 8, 10, 11, 15 to 19, 21, 29 to 31, and 33 to 39 would be allowable. The Office Action further indicated that that, upon filing of a proper terminal disclaimer, Claims 2 to 4, 9, and 12 to 14 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112. Applicants submit herewith a terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.321(c). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1 to 19, 21, 29 to 31, and 33 to 39 are now in condition for allowance.

Applicants submit herewith a check in the amount of \$130.00 to cover the cost of the terminal disclaimer. Please debit Deposit Account No. 02-1818 for any insufficiency of payment, or credit any over-payment.

The Office Action rejected Claims 20, 22, 27, 28, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 1,469, 275 to Moller et al. The Office Action also rejected Claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) for being obvious over Moller in view of U.S. Patent No. 5, 183,480 to Raterman et al. Applicants respectfully disagree with these rejections. Nevertheless, to expedite prosecution and to place this application in condition for allowance, Applicants have canceled Claims 20, 22 to 28, and 32 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to subsequently seek

protection of identical or similar scope to canceled Claims 20, 22 to 28, and 32 in one or more continuation applications.

An earnest endeavor has been made to place this application in condition for allowance and is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any questions related to this Response, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY 

Robert M. Gould  
Reg. No. 43,642  
Customer No. 29190  
(312) 807-4244

Dated: February 14, 2006